



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,964	10/04/2004	Shoichi Ishikawa	1391.1061	1007
21171 7590 08/29/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
ADAMS, CHARLES D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/509,964

Applicant(s)

ISHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

CHARLES D. ADAMS

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 5 June 2008, claims 1, 5, and 8-9 are amended, claim 7 is cancelled, and claim 10 is added per applicant's request. Claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10 are pending in the application.

Specification

2. Claims 8 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 8 is directed towards a computer readable medium. However, even with the amendment to the specification, it is unclear exactly what technology a 'computer readable medium' encompasses. Applicant is advised to amend the specification to include a recitation of technology available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that would clarify what is meant by the use of the phrase 'computer readable medium'.

Claim 10 is objected because the claim contains a recitation of a "computer central processing unit". However, there is no such hardware mentioned in the specification.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicant claims "a computer readable storage medium", and has amended the specification to recite the claimed subject

matter. However, it is unclear from the newly amended specification exactly what a computer readable storage medium entails. Reciting the claim language in the specification does not clarify a computer readable medium. Applicant is advised to include in the specification a recitation of technology or formats available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that would clarify what is meant by the phrase "computer readable medium".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milovanovic (US Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0065728) in view of Horn (US Pre-Grant Publication 2004/0177319).

As to claim 1, Milovanovic teaches:

analyzing a mail software folder configuration created on mail software to obtain information regarding the mail software folder configuration and creating a scanned data folder accessible by the mail software, if necessary (see paragraphs [0018] and [0024] and Figure 2, element 101);

Milovanovic does not teach:

creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software

Horn teaches creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software (see Horn paragraphs [0104], [0133], and [0135]. Also see paragraph [0024], [0031], and [0036]. A user may create a mirrored representation of a directory structure specified as a 'working set'),

Milovanovic as modified teaches and that reads documents by use of a scanner (see Horn paragraphs [0041] and [0043] and Milovanovic paragraph [0024]), copies those documents into the scanned data folder and files the documents, based upon the information obtained by the analysis of the mail software folder configuration created on the mail software (see Milovanovic paragraph [0024] and Horn paragraphs [0133] and [0135]); and

performing file management by executing filing processing for the created file system folder configuration (see Horn et al. paragraphs [0104], [0133], [0135], and [0179]), wherein

the analysis of the mail software folder configuration is performed at a time of startup of the file management software, regularly, or upon user's requests (see Horn paragraph [0179]), and

when the mail software folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the file system folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Milovanovic by the teachings of Horn, because Horn teaches that "the inventive MFS-enabled computer system's catalog mechanism provides unlimited support for new types of objects and new metadata, regardless of the underlying file system of operating system's features or lack thereof" (see paragraph [0139]).

As to claim 3, Milovanovic as modified teaches wherein mail data items are obtained from the mail software and are stored in corresponding folders created in the file system and mail data and other files are managed in the file system under a same environment (see Horn paragraphs [0139] and [0179]).

As to claim 5, Milovanovic as modified teaches wherein the mail software folder configuration of the mail software is created on two or more storage units (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

As to claim 6, Milovanovic as modified teaches wherein image data read by use of a scanner are simultaneously stored in the two or more storage units (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

As to claim 8, Milovanovic teaches:

analyzing a mail software folder configuration created on mail software to obtain information regarding the mail software folder configuration and creating a scanned data folder accessible by the mail software, if necessary (see paragraph [0024] and Figure 2, element 1);

Milovanovic does not teach:

creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software

Horn teaches:

creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software (see paragraphs [0104], [0133], and [0135]. Also see paragraphs [0024], [0031], and [0036]);

Milovanovic as modified teaches and that reads documents by use of a scanner (see Horn paragraphs [0041] and [0043] and Milovanovic paragraph [0024]), copies those documents into the scanned data folder, and files the documents based upon the information obtained by the analysis of the mail software folder configuration created on the mail software (see Milovanovic paragraph [0024] and Horn paragraphs [0133] and [0135]); and

performing file management by executing filing processing for the created file system folder configuration (see Horn paragraphs [0104], [0133], [0135], and [0179]), wherein

the analysis of the mail software folder configuration is performed at the time of startup of the file management software, regularly, or upon user's requests (see Horn paragraph [0179]), and

when the mail software folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the file system folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Milovanovic by the teachings of Horn, because Horn teaches that "the inventive MFS-enabled computer system's catalog mechanism provides unlimited support for new types of objects and new metadata, regardless of the underlying file system of operating system's features or lack thereof" (see paragraph [0139]).

As to claim 9, Milovanovic teaches:

analyzing, at a time of startup of the file management software, a mail software folder configuration created on mail software to obtain information regarding the mail software folder configuration and creating a scanned data folder accessible by the mail software, if necessary (see paragraph [0024] and Figure 2, element 1); and

Milovanovic does not teach creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration

Horn teaches creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration (see paragraphs [0104], [0133], and [0135]. Also see paragraphs [0024], [0031], and [0036])

Milovanovic as modified teaches in a file system that reads documents by use of a scanner (see Horn paragraphs [0041] and [0043] and Milovanovic paragraph [0024]), and files the documents, based upon the information obtained by the analysis of the mail software folder configuration created on the mail software (see Milovanovic paragraph [0024] and Horn paragraphs [0133] and [0135]), wherein

when the mail software folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the file system folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Milovanovic by the teachings of Horn, because Horn teaches that "the inventive MFS-enabled computer system's catalog mechanism provides unlimited support for new types of objects and new metadata, regardless of the underlying file system of operating system's features or lack thereof" (see paragraph [0139]).

As to claim 10, Milovanovic teaches:

a computer central processing unit (CPU) (see paragraph [0013] and Figure 1)
analyzing a mail software folder configuration created on mail software to obtain information regarding the mail software folder configuration and creating a scanned data

folder accessible by the mail software, if necessary (see paragraph [0024] and Figure 2, element 1);

Milovanovic does not teach:

creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software

Horn teaches:

creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration in a file system that is shared by the mail software (see Horn paragraphs [0104], [0133], and [0135]. Also see paragraphs [0024], [0031], and [0036]),

Milovanovic as modified teaches:

and that reads documents by use of a scanner (see Horn paragraphs [0041] and [0043] and Milovanovic paragraph [0024]), copies those documents into the scanned data folder and files the documents based upon the information obtained by the analysis of the mail software folder configuration created on the mail software (see Milovanovic paragraph [0024] and Horn paragraphs [0133] and [0135]); and

performing file management by executing filing processing for the created file system folder configuration (see paragraphs [0104], [0133], and [0135]) , wherein

the analysis of the mail software folder configuration is performed at a time of startup of the file management software (see Horn paragraph [0149]-[0150], and Milovanovic paragraph [0014]), and

when the mail software folder configuration of the mail software differs from that of the file system, the file system folder configuration of the file system is updated to match that of the mail software (see Horn paragraph [0179]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Milovanovic by the teachings of Horn, because Horn teaches that "the inventive MFS-enabled computer system's catalog mechanism provides unlimited support for new types of objects and new metadata, regardless of the underlying file system of operating system's features or lack thereof" (see paragraph [0139]).

6. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milovanovic (US Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0065728) in view of Horn (US Pre-Grant Publication 2004/0177319) and further in view of Sykes, JR. (US Pre-Grant Publication 2002/0129108).

Milovanovic teaches the method of claim 1.

Milovanovic does not teach wherein when a file is stored in a folder in the file system, a mail including information regarding a link to the file, detailed information of the file, and the file itself is transmitted to a mail address of a user, whereby the file is managed on the mail software

Sykes, JR teaches wherein when a file is stored in a folder in the file system, a mail including information regarding a link to the file, detailed information of the file, and the file itself is transmitted to a mail address of a user, whereby the file is managed on

the mail software (see Figures 2a and 2b, paragraphs [0010] and [0011]. When a message from the mail software is stored in the alternate file system, the system transmits a receipt to the sender that includes the original message (file). The receipt includes information regarding a link (a sender is told that it exists and is archived), detailed information of the file (the original message), and, as stated, the original message itself. As the receipt is transmitted to the user via email, the user may then manage the file on his or her email software).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brown et al. by the teaching of Sykes, JR since Sykes, JR teaches that “a problem with electronic communications versus their paper-based counterparts is that some electronic communications can be altered, sometimes without detection, and thus it is difficult to verify what was sent, when it was sent, or when it was received” (see paragraph [0003]).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5 June 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that “However, Milovanovic and Horn fail to disclose expressly or implicitly the claimed ‘creating a file system folder configuration same as the analyzed mail software folder configuration ... based upon the information obtained by the analysis of the mail software folder configuration created on the mail software’” and

"But the Office Action relies upon Horn. However, the relied upon Horn paragraphs of 104, 133, 135, and 139 (for motivation) merely discuss organizing all types of information objects using metadata." In response to this argument, it is noted that Horn et al. teaches in paragraph [0104] that all external objects are mirrored using reference objects. It is noted that mirroring would involve recreating the folder system configuration. In addition to this, a further analysis of Horn et al., such as paragraphs [0024], [0031], and [0036], shows that Horn et al. teaches to analyze a 'domain', wherein all files in the domain, including the directory structure, may be mirrored. Specifically, paragraph [0024] states "a domain designated 'file' may define reference objects, explained below, for files, directories, and volumes, as well as a scanning and matching process that creates a mirrored representation within MFS of a directory subtree specified in a Working Set". It is also noted that paragraph [0179] of Horn et al. teaches synchronizing items in the MFS with external data.

Applicant also argues that "A prima facie case of obviousness based upon Milovanovic and Horn cannot be established, because there is no evidence expressly or implicitly that one skilled in the art would combine Horn's information object organization, with Milovanovic's person name based mail folders, and then modify the combined system of Milovanovic and Horn to provide the claimed" subject matter. In response to this argument, it is noted that Horn et al. teaches a method of organizing data, including mail data. It is also noted that Horn et al. teaches in paragraph [0139] the possible benefit of organizing disparate data and quickly and dynamically viewing it

outside of a mail program. Milovanovic et al. teaches in paragraph [0024] a mail system that also deals with categorizing different forms of data when it arrives. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Milovanovic et al. in view of Horn et al.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLES D. ADAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M - F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164